

REMARKS

Applicants are submitting a replacement drawing sheet for Fig. 4 of the drawings and formally request the drawings be so amended. The correction to Fig. 4 is to correct for a minor typographical error in removal of reference number "64" that was inadvertently included in Applicants' previously submitted drawings. Applicants respectfully submit that the current changes to Fig. 4 do not add new matter into the application and are supported by Applicants' originally filed specification, claims and drawings.

In the Office Action mailed September 30, 2004, claims 8-10 were indicated as being allowable.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph for allegedly including new matter. The new matter that was alleged related to language calling for the container to cover a recess in a second planar surface. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3 and 4 have never included new matter, but in the present Amendment Applicants have amended claim 3 in order to remove the disputed language for the sole purpose of furthering prosecution. In the present Amendment, Applicants have removed the words "and covering at least one said recess in said second planar surface" from claim 3 and respectfully submit that claims 3 and 4 do not include new matter and do not suffer from any § 112 deficiencies.

Also in the Office Action of September 30, 2004, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being unclear as to how the articles set forth in line 20 of claim 1 relate to the articles in line 3 of claim 1. In the present Amendment, Applicants have amended claim 1 in order to ensure that there is no confusion regarding the articles set forth in lines 20 and 3. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 does not suffer from any § 112 deficiencies.

Also in the Office Action, claims 1 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Paikoff, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,523,679).

Claims 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ross, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,318,543).

Claims 3, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kalinski (U.S. Patent No. 5,311,990).

The Office Action also stated that claims 6 and 7 would be allowable if appropriately rewritten to overcome the § 112 rejections. In the present Amendment, Applicants have left claims 6 and 7 as dependent claims and have amended claim 1 so as to correct for any possible § 112 deficiencies. Claim 1 is in condition for allowance as discussed below and Applicants submit that claims 6 and 7 that depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 are also in condition for allowance.

Applicants thank Examiner Foster for the telephone conference conducted between approximately December 8, 2004 and December 10, 2004. Applicants have amended various claims as indicated that were discussed in the telephone conference and submit that all claims define over all prior art and are allowable. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3, 4-7 and 11-21 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully requested. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at his convenience to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.

December 14, 2004
Date

By: Neal P. Pierotti
Neal P. Pierotti
Registration No: 45,716
P.O. Box 1449
Greenville, SC 29602-1449
(864) 271-1592
Fax (864) 233-7342